



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

we find, I think, a sympathetic attitude in Lucretius towards the harmonious development of mind and body; see e. g. 3. 445-450:

Praeterea gigni pariter cum corpore et una
crescere sentimus pariterque senescere mentem.
nam velut infirmo pueri teneroque vagantur
corpore, sic animi sequitur sententia tenuis.
inde ubi robustis adolevit viribus aetas,
consilium quoque maius et auctor est animi vis.

In the verses following those which I have just cited allusion is still further made to the perfect correlation existing between the mind and the body throughout the several stages of human experience. Moreover, the aimless tottering about of the child of tender years is described with the feeling of a vividly susceptible temperament.¹ Then, also, the fear of children in the dark is set forth in 2. 55 ff. (cf. 1. 146, 6. 35-38); this is as reasonable a fear, declares the poet, as is ours sometimes in broad daylight. The rollicking play of the young is well depicted in 4. 400-403:

Atria versari et circumcursare columnae
usque adeo fit uti pueris videantur ubi ipsi
desierunt verti, vix ut iam credere possint
non supra sese ruere omnia tecta minari.

This reminds one, perhaps, of Horace's remark (Ars Poet. 158):

Reddere qui voces iam scit puer, et pede certo
Signat humum, gestit paribus colludere, etc.

The unsuspecting simplicity of childhood is formally touched upon in a familiar passage, 1. 939-949 (repeated exactly in 4. 14-24):

Sed veluti pueris absinthia taetra medentes
cum dare conantur, prius oras pocula circum
contingunt mellis dulci flavoque liquore,
ut puerorum aetas improvida ludificetur
labrorum tenuis, interea perpotet amarum
absinthii laticem deceptaque non capiatur,
sed potius tali pacto recreata valescat,
sic ego nunc, etc.

The wily physician, as yet unaware of the advantages of the modern sugar-coated pill or gelatine capsule, finds himself obliged to deceive his youthful charge, owing to its natural dislike for things bitter, by smearing honey around the rim of the cup of medicinal wormwood.

Again, the natural immaturity and indiscretion of children are alluded to in 3. 765 ff., a passage in which Lucretius expounds his elaborate argument to prove the soul's mortality.

It is doubtful if there is to be found anywhere in Latin literature a more beautiful picture of sympathetic tenderness for the young than in the verses

describing the conditions attendant upon a father's death, 3. 897 ff.:

Nam iam non domus accipet te laeta, neque uxor
optuma nec dulces occurrent oscula nati
praeripere, et tacita pectus dulcedine tangent.

With the second of these verses it is interesting to compare the strikingly similar words of Vergil (Georg. 2. 523): *Interea dulces pendent circum oscula nati*, etc. In this connection one may readily recall the pathetic scene in the gruesome picture drawn by Lucretius of the plague at Athens: corpses of parents stretched on their dead children, and again, sometimes children expiring on the bodies of their mothers and fathers.

Although the Epicureans seem to have professed not to believe in marriage and the begetting of children (cf. Diog. Laert., X, §§ 118-119), still sufficient proof is afforded in Lucr. 5. 1018 ff. of the poet's realization of the mellowing effect produced, during the progress of civilization, upon the harsh temper of parents by the coaxing of their children, and of the justice of making due allowance for weak bodies and undeveloped minds.

In conclusion, it appears somewhat probable that the Lucretian verdict would be inclined to coincide with Cicero's remark (De Sen. 83): "Si quis deus mihi largiatur, ut ex hac aetate repuerascam et in cunis vagiam, valde recusen".

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

ANDREW OLIVER

REVIEWS

The Frogs of Aristophanes. Edited with Introduction, Commentary, and Critical Notes by T. G. Tucker. London and New York: The Macmillan Co. (1906). Pp. lix + 276.

In the preface Mr. Tucker assures the reader that the aim of this edition is "primarily educational". The editorial *ego* is to keep constantly before it the information that may be judiciously imparted to a student who is at the "stage for which this book is intended". An admirable pedagogical *credo*, which, however, Mr. Tucker found difficult to observe consistently. He listened very often to those monitions of his scholarly daemon that moved him to "contribute to the exegesis and the criticism of the play in a sufficient measure to deserve some attention from scholars".

This duality of purpose has impaired the value of the book as a text for the class-room—and we must surmise from the author's words that he would wish his work to be criticised primarily as a school edition. The book lacks homogeneity. The elementary and the erudite rub against each other in introduction and notes as promiscuously as did *χλαίνα* and *σισύρα* in the Athenian fish-market. For the American undergraduate at least, much of Mr. Tucker's pabulum is too strong. On the other hand, as a "learned edition" the book of course

¹ Lucretius is, however, thinking rather of the decay of the body than of its growth and development; he is seeking to prove the mortality of the soul by showing that the soul has, in a multitude of respects, experiences identical with those of the body, and so by parity of reasoning, to deduce the conclusion that the soul will die even as the body dies.—C. K.

cannot vie with the author's Supplices and Choe-phori of Aeschylus.

In the introduction the historical setting and the motives of the play are, to be sure, tersely, yet adequately discussed. Thereafter Mr. Tucker has seen fit to reprint with a few changes of phrase the article in *Classical Review* 18 (1904), 416 ff., in which he sought to prove that the mysteries referred to in the *Frogs* are the Lesser Rites celebrated at Agrae across the Ilissus and not the Eleusinian Mysteries. It is difficult to see what place such a discussion has in this book. For the professional scholar access to the original paper is easy. A clever undergraduate *might* get the gist of Mr. Tucker's argument after he had read the Chorus of the *Mystae* in the play itself—he certainly could not do so before. Furthermore, in a book the aim of which is "primarily educational", it seems scarcely good form or fair to use the commentary and the introduction to propagate a view to which there are grave objections and which has by no means supplanted the traditional theory. The introduction likewise contains an elaborate exposition of the metrical usages of comedy, and a tabular Aristophanic jest-book. This last section is full of rather obvious information which the student might better gain for himself as he reads the play—if he really needs any new instruction in the humor of comedians. A student who has read a play of Plautus or a comedy of Shakespeare will not be amazed at meeting puns, expletives, words humorously manufactured, slang, surprise words. Why, therefore, warn him at the expenditure of line after line of examples culled not alone from the *Frogs* but from plays that the average student will never read, even if he learns to know the Latin abbreviations of their titles, that Greek comedy *is* comedy? Something might be left to a student's sense of humor and to his teacher.

In the notes the same contrasts prevail as in the introduction. Now the author evidently labors to keep the undergraduate point of view, as when he warns the learner that *στι* is not elided (22), that *ἐχρῶ* = *ἐχρᾶον*, and obligingly turns a secondary sequence into primary tenses (110). A few pages later the student is treated to a disquisition on the evolution of the optative with a reference to Brugmann. Throughout the notes, for illumination on syntactical questions, he is referred most frequently to Kühner-Gerth. The inclusion of critical matter in the commentary makes the notes hard reading. Sometimes the author sets off the critical and the learned by means of brackets. These parenthetical digressions and postscripts are cumbersome.

So much for the method of Mr. Tucker's book, which is in many respects unfortunate. On the other hand, in examining the facts and the fancies of text and of commentary the reader cannot but

be impressed with the wide reading and the scholarship that are displayed on every page.

The author has treated the text with becoming conservatism. He is constantly on the alert to support the Mss. in preference to emendations sanctioned by most editors. Cf. *ἐπιπλεῖ* 197, as against *ἐτι πλεῖ*; *ἀπόδος* for *ἀπόδου*, 235. In six places the editor introduces conjectures of his own. In 957 *ἐριν τεχνάζειν* for *ἐράν, τεχνάζειν* is so good a characterization of Euripidean contentiousness that one would like to be sure that Aristophanes wrote it. In 320 Mr. Tucker prefers *δι' ἀγορᾶς* of V to *Διαγόρας* of R. He does not tell us how he squares this reading with his notion that the scene of the Chorus of the *Mystae* is the environs of his putative Iaccheum-on-Ilissus. The song to which Xanthias alludes is the following chorus which, if we follow Mr. Tucker's view, is not sung anywhere near the agora but on the other side of the city.

In the notes there is much that is new. Mr. Tucker is an apt Verrallian and his interpretations are often suggestive even when they fail to convince. For parody he has a keen scent. In detecting travesty and quotation he goes far in advance of such recent editors as Van Leeuwen and Rogers and he adds upwards of twelve passages to those listed by Bakhuyzen in his *De Parodia in Comoediis Aristophanis*. Metrical indications furnish Mr. Tucker his most prized touchstone. Often, be it said with deference, he draws largely upon his imagination. When he proposes to reconstruct as a parodied original of the *Frogs'* Chorus a serious lyric about swans, he does two things that he would better have left undone. He strives unnecessarily to add to the humor of the chorus. He fails to remember that here we have to do with Aristophanes, the charming lyricist of the *Birds*, not with Aristophanes the *farceur*.

In other passages in which there is parody, Mr. Tucker is eager to discover some definite lost original and indulges in ingenious suggestions as to content and language. This is a scholarly diversion, but it is loose criticism. There is parody and parody, as Cicero well knew. There are parodies of single poems like the Virgilian *Sabinus ille quem videtis hospites* and Carroll's *Hiarwatha's Photographing*; there are parodies of literary forms such as Calverley's *Ballad on Butter and Eggs* and a *Pound of Cheese*, and of stylistic mannerisms, such as Pope's parodies of early English poets, and Kipling's parodies of Browning. Aristophanes could disport himself in a masterly fashion in such imitative travesty as is shown by the inimitable monody of *The Stolen Rooster*, 1331 ff. It may well be that where Mr. Tucker seeks a definite original Aristophanes may have had no particular poem in mind. Especially it would be the part of a wise conservatism to describe 814-829 as a tragico-epic burlesque

rather than to mourn because having "lost the original we are compelled to miss most of the humor" of the passage—a subjective verdict with which I claim the right to disagree.

All editors of Aristophanes ought to take to heart that line of the English humorist,

"Since then I've never dared to be as funny as I can". Thus Mr. Tucker in his note on 657 feels that there is no humor in the excuse of Xanthias, "Ouch! Take the thorn out of my foot" and hence supposes that Xanthias slips into the words of a popular song. But surely to the sandaled Athenians the joke would strike home. It is the prototype of the time-honored "business" of the carpet-tack. In a similar fashion humor, says Mr. Tucker, must be read into the "oil-flask" episode by assuming that catch-words from a game of forfeits are rung in now and then. But the scene does not pall if the fun all through lies, as it certainly must in 1223, in the confusion of the material lecythium and the stylistic. Such foolery is in the true Aristophanic vein. Cf. the physical effect on Dionysus of the Aeschylus "blows" in 1278 ff. A satisfactory interpretation of 1114 has yet to be suggested. An allusion to some manual of tactics is no more probable than the notion of the libretto in the hands of each spectator.

These flaws have been noted in Mr. Tucker's treatment of parodied and quoted passages: 840 and 931 are Euripidean reminiscences and should be so printed; 1300 is printed as a quotation without comment in the notes; 844 is "evidently a line of Aeschylus quoted against himself", says Mr. Tucker. Van Leeuwen ad loc. proves that the line is in the style of Euripides and hence prints it as a quotation. Kock and Rogers, though not Bakhuyzen, regard it as an out-and-out parody of Cyclops 423. Certainly the commentary should contain some notice of this probability instead of presenting a mere guess.

The book is very free from typographical errors. I close with the following *obiter dicta*:

217-219. Modern topographers are not so certain as is Mr. Tucker that "Limnae was the low-lying portion of *Southeastern Athens*"; cf. Judeich, *Top. von Athen*, 261 ff.

293. Surely the underlying notion of Horace's *pede poena claudo* is not that of a demon with a misshapen leg. The thought is simply of the slow approach of retribution expressed in Tibullus' *Sera tamen tacitis Poena venit pedibus* and a host of other passages in Greek and Latin authors; cf. Otto *Sprichwörter der Römer*, 111; Vanucci, *Proverbi*, 3. 174.

906. *elnóvas* is correctly explained by Mr. Tucker as "odious comparisons". Add to his references Xenophon, *Symp.* chap. 6, a locus classicus for the

appreciation of this kind of witticism and compare also Horace, *Sat.* 1.5.56 *equi te esse feri similem dico*.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

DUANE REED STUART

A History of Architecture. By Russell Sturgis. Volume I: Antiquity. New York: the Baker and Taylor Company (1906). Pp. xxvi + 425; 336 illustrations.

Of the History of Architecture, in three large volumes, undertaken by Mr. Russell Sturgis, easily the foremost of American writers on architecture, the first volume, on architecture in antiquity, was issued some months since by the Baker and Taylor Company. It supplies an interesting foretaste of what promises to be a monumental work. It covers in twenty-four chapters grouped in five books the subjects of architecture in Egypt, in Western Asia to 300 B. C., in Greece, among the Italian Peoples before Roman control, and Imperial Rome. The point of view is that of the travelled scholar, more interested in the monuments themselves and in the thought and spirit of which they are expressions, than in mere archaeology and statistical erudition concerning them, although the author is thoroughly versed in the results of that erudition through lifelong and widely varied reading. Mr. Sturgis writes for the layman and amateur rather than for the architect; for that "general public" whom he has already so well served in his *How to Judge Architecture* and his *The Artist's Way of Working*. Writing for this public he has produced less a history of ancient architecture than a series of related essays, analytical and critical, on certain aspects of ancient architecture. He does not at all picture the great movements and by-currents of architecture as a whole, but paints admirably those phases of its history which have most engaged his interest, passing lightly over those for which he cares less or not at all. The style is therefore more familiar and discursive, more personal and entertaining, than it might have been with a more rigidly historical plan. The chronological relation is almost ignored; many important monuments are not even mentioned; maps and lists of monuments and architects are wanting; very few plans are shown; the illustrations are pictorial rather than technical in character, and everything indicates the purposed appeal to the general reader rather than the serious student—at least, the professional student.

Given such a conception in the planning of the work, the first volume fulfills its purpose excellently. Its analyses, its criticisms and its *obiter dicta* are interesting, often acute and original. The chapters on Greek art are particularly clear, easily read and discriminating; there is total avoidance of the gush and extravagance so often met with